

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION

United States of America,

Case No. 3:17-cr-55

Plaintiff,

v.

MEMORANDUM OPINION  
AND ORDER

Dennis Garrett,

Defendant.

**I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND**

Defendant Dennis Garrett was charged by indictment with one count of conspiracy to possess with intent to distribute and distribution of heroin, three counts of distribution of heroin, and one count of use of a telecommunications facility to facilitate a drug conspiracy. (Doc. No. 17). Garrett subsequently pled guilty, and I sentenced him to a total term of 18 months in custody and 3 years of supervised release. (Doc. No. 535).

Garrett was released from prison on July 22, 2020. He has filed a motion seeking the early termination of his term of supervised release. (Doc. No. 808). The government has filed a brief in opposition to Dotson's motion. (Doc. No. 814). The U.S. Pretrial Services and Probation Officer provided an informational supervision report as well. (Doc. No. 813). For the reasons stated below, I deny Garret's motion.

**II. DISCUSSION**

Modification of a term of supervised release is governed by § 3583(e). That subsection permits a court to terminate a term of supervised release after the expiration of one year of

supervised release if the early termination is “warranted by the conduct of the defendant . . . and the interest of justice,” as well as the factors set forth in § 3553(a)(1), (a)(2)(B), (a)(2)(C), (a)(2)(D), (a)(4), (a)(5), (a)(6), and (a)(7). 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(1).

While Garrett has served over one year of his term of supervised release, I conclude he has not demonstrated that early termination is appropriate. Though he asserts he has complied with all court orders, (Doc. No. 808 at 1), he previously violated at least one condition of his supervised release, (*see* Doc. No. 727), and his probation officer states Garrett has required frequent reminders regarding his monthly supervision reports. (*See* Doc. No. 813 at 3). Garrett has not identified a basis to reconsider his term of supervised release and, having taken into account the applicable § 3553(a) factors, I conclude early termination is not appropriate at this time.

### **III. CONCLUSION**

I conclude Garrett has not established that early termination of his period of supervised release is warranted. Therefore, and for the reasons set forth above, I deny his motion for early termination. (Doc. No. 808).

So Ordered.

s/ Jeffrey J. Helmick  
United States District Judge